

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the Office Action mailed June 23, 2006.

By this Amendment, claim 5 has been amended to more particularly define the present invention. Support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the original claims, see, for example, page 1, line 8, and page 25, lines 15-16 of the specification. Thus, claims 5-8 are currently pending for the Examiner's consideration.

In view of this amendment, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) or §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Singer (U.S. Patent 4,836,468), Van Mullekom (U.S. Patent 5,107,904), Hinchliffe et al. (U.S. Patent 5,244,160), Mohnkern et al. (U.S. Patent 5,323,178), Ligon (U.S. Patent 5,624,082) or Sato et al. (U.S. Patent 6,911,300). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

To constitute anticipation of the claimed invention, a single prior art reference must teach each and every limitation of the claims. Here, in this case, none of the cited references teach the claimed invention of:

*“A roll stock apparatus **for gravure printing** comprising:
a turn-table **rotatably arranged against a base plate**,
a plurality of process rolls standing obliquely in a circumferential arrangement
in one stage or two stages at a roll pallet, said roll pallet being located on the turn-table,
wherein a longitudinal direction of the process rolls coincides with a generatrix
at a conical surface, and
wherein said roll pallet can be stopped at a predetermined position to
store or take out the process rolls against the roll pallet.”*

Applicants believe that most of the cited references (Singer, Van Mullekom, Hinchliffe et al., Mohnkern et al. and Ligon) teach process rolls unrelated to gravure printing. Further, Applicant strongly believes that Sato et al. does not at all teach *a plurality of process rolls standing obliquely in a circumferential arrangement in one stage or two stages at a roll pallet, said roll pallet being located on the turn-table, wherein a longitudinal direction of the process rolls coincides with a generatrix at a conical surface*. Still further, Applicants also strongly believe that none of the cited references teach or suggest *“a turn-table **rotatably arranged against a base plate**”*.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reviews the process rolls of the present invention in view of amended claim 5 and how the claimed process rolls differs from the process rolls of the cited references.

Thus, since the cited references clearly fail to teach each and every limitation of the claims, this rejection cannot be sustained and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are believed to be clearly patentable over the outstanding rejections. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the claims in light of the above remarks is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Dated: September 12, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

David T. Nikardo

Registration No.: 22,663

Lee Cheng

Registration No.: 40,949

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
1233 20th Street, N.W. Suite 501 Washington,
DC 20036
(202) 955-3750
Attorneys for Applicant

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 180013 for any such fees; and applicant(s) hereby petition for any needed extension of time.